Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—May I know whether these officers were promoted and the promotion lists have been approved by the P.S.C. ?

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—The matter is pending with the P.S.C. and we are awaiting their recommendation.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—May I know whether the cases of the officers who have been promoted were referred to the P.S.C. ?

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—These posts belong to the State cadre. They are referred to the P.S.C. for their concurrence and I do not know at what stage the matter is. Their concurrence will be obtained for all these posts.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—In answer to supplementary question (*e*) it is stated that two P. I.s belong to the Scheduled Castes and their case will be given due consideration. May I know whether these people are not in the State Police service ?

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—They are in the State Police service. They are still serving.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Then, may I know what is it that is under consideration ?

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—The consideration is for promotion to A. S. P.'s cadre.

ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ನಾಗರತ್ನಮ್ಮ.—ಈ ಪೆಡ್ಯೂಲು ಕ್ಯಾಸ್ಟು ಪಂಗಡದವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಈ ಮೆರಿಟ್ಟು ಆಗಲಿ ಎಫಿಷಿಯೆಂಟು ಸರ್ವಿನ್ಸು ಆಗಲಿ ಒಂದೂ ಕೌಂಟು ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಅಲ್ಲವೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಎಂ. ಪೂಣಚ್ಚ.—ಪೆಡ್ಯೂಲು ಕಾಸ್ಟು ಆಗಲೀ ಯಾವ ಪಂಗಡಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದವರಾಗಲೀ ಅವರುಗಳ ಮೆರಿಟ್ಟು ಎಂದರೆ ಅರ್ಹತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅವರ ಪ್ರಮೋಷನ್ನುಗಳನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಣಯಿಸಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Question hour is over.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Re: **Death of Smt. Muniamma.**

Mr. SPEAKER.—On the 6th instant Hon'ble Member Sri Y. Veerappa and two other Hon'ble Members, namely, Sri C. J. Muckannappa and Sri B. K. Puttaramaiya, gave notices of adjournment motions relating to the conduct of the Seshadripuram Police in respect of one Shrimathi Muniamma and her subsequent death in the Victoria Hospital. On the 10th instant, after I read out the notices of these adjournment motions, the Hon'ble Home Minister stated that the cause of death of Shrimathi Muniamma was being enquired into under the Criminal Procedure Code. The question therefore arose for decision as to whether such an enquiry would preclude consideration of these adjournment motions in the House and I requested the Advocate General to speak on this issue. On the 11th instant the Advocate General expressed his views on the question of *sub judice* in relation to these motions. He stated that an enquiry was being conducted into the cause of death of Shrimathi Muniamma by a Magistrate under section 176 of the Criminal Procedure Code. He also argued on the question of whether an enquiry under section 176 of the Criminal Procedure Code would preclude consideration of any matter by the House. He has since also written to me furnishing some recent decisions bearing on the point. I however learn that the Magistrate has concluded his enquiry.

(Addressing the Hon'ble the Home Minister) : I take that the Magistrate has concluded the enquiry ?

Sri C. M. POONACHA (Minister for Home Affairs and Industries).—He has not concluded his enquiry.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yesterday I was given to understand by some highest authority that the enquiry was complete.

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—I made further enquiries and learn that the investigating Magistrate is still conducting enquiries.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then, I will have to reserve my ruling. I was given to understand by a high authority that the enquiry is complete. Now I learn that the enquiry is still going on. So, I will give the ruling tomorrow.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ಇವತ್ತೇ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಿರಿ . . . .

(*At this stage there were many interruptions*).

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will have to understand whether enquiry under Section 176 is over I will give my ruling today only after 10-30 A.M.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Challakere).—Your ruling need not depend upon whether enquiries are complete or not.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No, no.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—The concerned Minister says that an enquiry is still going on. The ruling to be given need not depend upon the fact whether an enquiry is still going or not.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point is that if the enquiry is over a new situation arises. But if the enquiry is still on, the situation is quite different. I was given to understand yesterday that the enquiry was over and on that basis I have prepared the ruling. Now if the enquiry is on, a different situation arises and therefore I have to give an exhaustive ruling.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Then on that basis you are giving the ruling.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—Whether the enquiry under Section 176 is completed or not, I do not think the decision of the Chair would be affected by it. Irrespective of whether the enquiry under Section 176 is over or is still pending the decision of the Chair remains the same, in view of the latest decisions on the subject.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the enquiry is proceeding, my ruling should concern whether the question is *sub judice* or not. Now I learn that the question is still under enquiry by the Magistrate under Section 176.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—How does it affect the decision of the Chair —whether the enquiry is proceeding or not.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Gubbi).—What the Home Minister stated just now, is not relevant to your decision. Why should the Chair, first of all, seek any clarification from the Home Minister?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾನು ಎರಡು ಬೇಸಿಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. 176ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಎಂಕ್ವೈರಿ ಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಂದು ತರಹ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಂಕ್ವೈರಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ನಬ್ ಜುಡಿಸ್ ಹೌದೆ ಅಲ್ಲವೆ ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. 10½ ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ನನ್ನ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಮೇಲೆ ನಮಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA (Chamarajanagar).—On a point of information. Sir, ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ್ ಜನರಲ್ ಒಂದು ಕಾಗದ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಯಿತು. ಅದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಸಭೆಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸುವುದು ಉತ್ತಮವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ್ ಜನರಲ್ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri N. HUCHAMASTHY GOWDA (Chandrasekharapura).—On a point of order, Sir. ಈಗ 10½ ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಾಗಿ ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗುವುದು ಸರಿಯೆ? ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವೆಲ್ಲದೆ?

[As several Members held the floor and spoke simultaneously, the Speaker directed that the proceedings need not be recorded. Later, he permitted Sri Mallaradhya to speak.]

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, you just said that you are about to give a ruling based on some advice given by the Advocate General, subsequent to the advice he had given while he was in this House. If that is so, we would like to know the cases he had quoted and the reasons behind his advice.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That question arises only after I give the ruling, taking into consideration the fact that the proceedings under Section 176 are still on. After I give the ruling, if Members have any doubt, they can raise them. But there is no occasion for such a thing at this stage.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—My difficulty is that the Advocate General was given a full opportunity, for nearly one hour, to state the case and quote decisions. If after he left the House, he has quoted more decisions, let us have them.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You are simply over-anxious.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Not at all.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I still say that you are over-anxious. After hearing my ruling on the present basis, if you have any doubt, you can raise it.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—What has your decision to do with the question whether proceedings under Section 176 is pending or not?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Everything. I have been telling and telling the Member that I have to differentiate between two situations: One is if the enquiry under Section 176 is over, my ruling would be different. If 176 is still on, my ruling would be on the question whether the matter is *sub judice*. If the proceedings under 176 are over, my ruling would be different, because then a new situation arises.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—Sir, the Chair was pleased to say that there is another higher authority which had told him that the proceedings under Section 176 in this case are over. I would like to know which is the authority higher than the Home Minister. Secondly, I would like to point out that this question has been discussed on the floor of this House and certain matters were squarely placed before the Chair for his ruling. Now I am unable to understand how the Chair could entertain extraneous information, on which it would give a ruling. The ruling has therefore to be based on what transpired on the floor of the House and if the Chair has come into possession certain other information, of which the House was unaware when it discussed the matter, then I would very humbly submit that that information must be supplied to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Speaker cannot over-ride certain facts. After all, the Speaker has to ascertain facts, even if they are to be obtained from outside the House. In this case, I am given to understand that the proceedings under Section 176 are over. Of course, as to who gave this information, is an irrelevant matter. It must necessarily have come from an authority that has complete control over the situation. Now the Government has given the information that the proceedings are still going on. Nobody need bother about it now. After I give the ruling, Members may raise doubts if any.

The House then adjourned for recess at Ten of the Clock and reassembled at Thirty Minutes past Ten of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Mr. SPEAKER.—On the 6th instant Hon'ble Member, Sri Y. Veerappa and two other Hon'ble Members, namely, Shri C. J. Muckannappa and Sri B. K. Puttaramiya, gave notice of adjournment motions relating to the conduct of Seshadripuram Police in respect of one Smt. Muniamma and her subsequent death in the Victoria Hospital. On the 10th instant, after I read out the notice of these adjournment motions, the Hon'ble Home Minister stated that the cause of death of Smt. Muniamma was being enquired into under the Criminal Procedure Code. The question therefore arose for decision as to whether such an enquiry would preclude consideration of these adjournment motions in the House and I requested the Advocate General to speak on this issue. On the 11th instant the Advocate General expressed his views on the queston of *sub judice* in relation to these motions. He stated that an enquiry was being conducted into the cause of death of Smt. Muniamma by a Magistrate under Section 176 of the Criminal Procedure Code. He stated that while Art. 194 of the Constitution conferred on the members absolute privilege of freedom of speech and no action would lie against any member for contempt of court or defamation or any other kind of action in respect of speeches made on the floor, nevertheless the House had itself imposed certain restrictions on this freedom of speech. One of them was to shut out debate or speeches in regard to any matter which was under adjudication by a court of law having jurisdiction in part of India. He next expressed the view that what was ruled out of debate by this limitation under the Rules of Procedure must be treated as co-extensive with whatever was treated as contempt under the Contempt of Courts Act. Speaking in particular as to the nature of proceedings under Section 176 of the Criminal

Procedure Code, the learned Advocate General referred to certain decisions particularly A.I.R. 1928-Bombay, page 300 and A. I. R. 1940 Rangoon, and stated that proceedings under section 176 of the Criminal Procedure Code are judicial proceedings and any comment in respect of them would amount to contempt. He next advanced the view that as laid down in I.L.R. 1939—Madras and A.I.R. 1943 Lahore, an offence of contempt may be committed even if there is no proceeding or cause actually pending, provided that such proceeding or cause is imminent and the writer of the offending publications either knew it to be imminent or should have known that it was imminent.

The learned Advocate General has subsequently written to me to say that he has come across a more recent decision of the Punjab High Court in which it has been held that a Magistrate holding an enquiry under section 176 of the Criminal Procedure Code cannot be considered to be performing the functions of a Court of Law. He has stated in his letter that any comment outside the House not being contempt in the circumstances there is no restriction of comment within the House. In view of this decision and the view now expressed by the learned Advocate General, I must hold that for the purpose of rule 40 (*f*) an enquiry under section 176 of the Criminal Procedure Code cannot be considered to be a matter which is under adjudication by a court of law. The objection of *sub judice* will not therefore apply. The general question of whether what should be excluded from the debate would be whatever would amount to contempt of court, need not be either examined or decided on the present occasion. This would require much more detailed examination particularly as the composition and powers of the Legislature under the Constitution require that fullest freedom of speech should be conceded to members and any limitation on this freedom which is essential for the proper discharge of their functions and duties should be construed very strictly. For instance, while in some cases it has been held to be contempt even if a proceeding or cause is not actually pending but is imminent, the extension of this principle to the debates in this House may really lead to such curtailment as may interfere with the proper discharge of the duties by members. However as I stated it is not necessary for me to decide this issue on this occasion.

While the objection of *sub judice* may not apply, I am afraid that there are other rulings of our own Assembly as well as of other Legislatures which prevent me from accepting this Notice. There are long series of rulings to the effect where other parliamentary opportunities are available very soon for raising the matter which is the subject matter of adjournment, such adjournment motions are inadmissible. Hon'ble Members will have sufficient opportunity during debate on the Budget to raise this issue. There is also a short notice question which is pending and is likely to be taken up soon. In view of these opportunities, the adjournment motions become inadmissible and I hold that they are out of order. I must also add at the end that today we are discussing Vote on Account and Members are at full liberty to make their comments on this incident.

Members' Representations.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ (ಹಿರಿಯೂರು).—ಪ್ರೋಟ್ ಆನ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ಬಂದಾಗ ನಿನ್ನೆದಿವಸ . . . . . .

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನನ್ನ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಚೇಂಬರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬನ್ನಿ. ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಆಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಹೌಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಿಮ್ಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಮತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ತೊಡಕಿಗೆ ಬೀಳಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಬಹಳ ಜನ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಆದರಿಂದ ಏನೂ ಉಪಯೋಗ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನನ್ನ ಚೇಂಬರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದು ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಅನುಮತಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರ ಎಲ್ಲರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ನಿನ್ನೆ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಚ್ಯುತಿ ಬಂದಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಅಪ್ಲಿಕೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡುವವರಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಇದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಬೇರೆ ಒಂದು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಕೊಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಅದರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನನ್ನ ಕೈಗೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ನೀವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಯಿತು. ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡೋಣ. ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನಬೇಕು. ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ನಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರೈಮಾಫೇಸಿ ಕೇಸು ಇದೆಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಅದರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I must be satisfied that there is a *prima facie* case. The office has received the notice. That will be examined. If there is a *prima facie* case, I will allow you to raise it here.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಅಪ್ಲಿಕೇಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಬರೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಿಚಾರ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟೀಕರಿಸಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಿಯಮಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಬರವಣಿಗೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಮೇಲೆ *prima facie* case ಇದೆಯೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಬಿಡುವುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡುವುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—173 ನೆಯ ವಿಧಿಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇಂಥಾ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತಕ್ಷಣ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನನ್ನ ಅವಲೋಕನಕ್ಕೆ ಕೂಡ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥ ಮಾಡುವುದು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ನಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಬಹಳ ಹೊತ್ತಾಯಿತು.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—Sir, I am the person who has given notice for the privilege motion and if I remember correctly, I have given it within half-an-hour of my entering the Assembly Hall. I request kind indulgence of the Speaker to give a chance to the Leader of the Opposition to explain.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not deny the chance to the Leader of the Opposition. But, I must find out whether there is *prima facie* case or not. You say, you have given it about 8-30. I am in the House since this morning; how can I examine it? I will consider it later on.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The position requires a little latitude.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನೀವು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಅರ್ಧ ಗಂಟೆಯ ಹಿಂದೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ನಾನು ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಇದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನೋಡುತ್ತಿ ್ದ. ನಾನು ಈವರೆಗೂ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಹೇಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯ!

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—173 ನೆಯ ವಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲ ಹೀಗಿದೆ:

> "(2) A motion on a matter of privilege arising during the sitting of the Assembly is, notwithstanding anything contained in rules 41 and 43 entitled to immediate precedence over all other business,"

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—*Prima facie* case ಇದೆಯೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡದೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಅದರ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದು? Should I not examine it?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is for this reason, Sir. The consequent conduct of the proceedings of this House is depending on the statement you are making. In fact, the privilege motion is not going to be discussed immediately.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have made the position clear. Unless there is *prima facie* case, I cannot allow. Since I am sitting in the House, I had no opportunity to examine the motion. I must have some time to consider whether it is permissible or not.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA (Channapatna).—I rise to a point of order, Sir. ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರ ಕಾಲವಾದಮೇಲೆ, ಹೇಳಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡುವ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರಂತೆ ನಮಗೆ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆಯೆ ಅಥವ ಇಲ್ಲವೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇದು ಹಳೆಯ ಮಾತು. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ 'ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್' ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ, Clarification ಬೇಕು ಅಷ್ಟೆ. ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಒಂದು 'ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಮೋಷನ್' ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ನಾನು ಅದನ್ನು ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ನನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದು ಅನುಮತಿ ಪಡೆದು ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅನುಮತಿಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—I raise another point of order.

ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ನಾವು ಡಿವಿಜ್ ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ 34 ಜನರಿದ್ದಾಗ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹೋಯಿತು . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will not allow any Hon'ble member to raise that question. I have already said that I will examine the motion that is tabled and if I think that there is a *prima facie* case, I shall allow it. Directly or indirectly I will not allow this matter to be discussed. There is an end of the matter.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA (Holenarasipur).—Sir, you were pleased to make some observation regarding the adjournment motion. For heaven's sake, I am not entering into the merits or finding fault with the decision of the esteemed Chair. You were pleased to state that it does not amount to adjudication because of several reasons. Would it not frustrate rule 40 of the VIII Chapter if opportunity is not accorded to discuss this matter—an important matter of recent nature which affects the prestige, honour and safety of our brothers and sisters ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all, the Hon'ble Member is trying to over-ride my ruling in an indirect method. I have said that I have disallowed the adjournment motion. There is the end of the matter. If the Hon'ble Member wants to speak on the matter, there is an opportunity because we are going to discuss the Vote on Account.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Sri C. M. POONACHA (Minister for Industries and Home Affairs).—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table the State Transport Undertakings (Mysore) Rules, 1958 issued under Section 68-1 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939 (Central Act IV of 1939).

BUDGET FOR 1958-59—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS ON ACCOUNT.

No. 2—Land Revenue

7. Land Revenue

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 50,79,000 be granted 'on account' to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the period from 1st April 1958 to end of 31st day of July 1958, in respect of 'Land Revenue'."

Before discussion starts, I must say that members should take that all the Demands are before the House and they may make remarks in respect of all the Demands including the one which I have now put before the House.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾವು ನಿನ್ನೆ ಸೋತಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈಗ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ 'Vote on Account' ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಹೊರಟು ಹೋಗುತ್ತೇವೆ. We stage a walk out.

(The Opposition members withdrew from the House.)

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—Sir, I have a small technical difficulty which I would like to place before you. I want to know whether this Vote on Account is placed before the House under the provisions of Rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the House. I hope that the vote on account for the period from 1st April to end of July will have to be covered by certain provisions and it is under the provisions of Rule 127 that it is placed before the House. Therefore it is also necessary that it should be circumscribed by Rule 121 relating to demands for grants and so this has to be done in consultation with the Estimates Committee. I would like to know the necessity for placing before this House the vote on account for a period of 4 months. An explanation for the same may kindly be given. I would also like to know the opinion of the Estimates Committee when it was consulted as contemplated by the provisions of Rule 121.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Estimates Committee is supposed to send the form only.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I want to know why this piecemeal vote on account is being placed before the House.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—I think I have already explained the reasons for adopting this method. This method has been adopted because by that members may have the opportunity of discussing the budget at greater length item by item and department by department when the demands for grants come before the House instead of being required to finish the discussion before the end of